



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RE THE APPLICATION OF:

Miller et al.

Grp. Art. Unit: 1724

Application No: 10/679,175

Examiner: Pham, Minh Chau Thi

Filing Date: October 3, 2003

Date: December 18, 2006

SCREEN FILTER ASSEMBLY  
AND ENGINE USING SAME


Atty. Dkt. No: 03-308

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

In response to the Office Action dated October 23, 2006, please consider the following remarks. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Gullett in view of Carlson. Applicants respectfully disagree since Gullett does not even show what the office action asserts, let alone disclose all of the features of Applicants claimed invention except for the metallic screen filter element, and Carlson does not remedy these defects. While Applicants readily concede that Gullett teaches a center support having a filter head attachment adjacent one end, it flatly fails to show a center support with a bowl attachment adjacent its opposite end for rotatable attachment to, and detachment from, a bowl. There should be no dispute that Gullett shows and specifically teaches at column 5, lines 48-52 that the center support 40 is either welded to, or molded with, the bowl 25. Reiterating, Applicants' claims require that the center support be rotatably attachable and detachable from the bowl, not permanently affixed as clearly taught in Gullett. While it is true that Gullett teaches a threaded bowl attachment to the filter head, that is not what Applicants have claimed. There should be no dispute that the MPEP and relevant case law require that all of an Applicants' claim features be shown by the combination of references cited to support a §103(a) rejection. Since Gullett does not show Applicants' rotatable attachment/detachment feature between the center support and bowl, and because Carlson clearly fails to remedy that defect, a prima facie case of obviousness under §103 can not possibly be made by any fair combination of the two cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Applicant also respectfully notes that the subject matter of claims 9 and 11 are not even addressed in the office action. And therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections

I certify that this paper or fee was mailed with sufficient postage via first class mail on the 18th day of December, 2006 to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450; Name Printed : Carrie Stremming; Signature  Carrie Stremming